DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 082 SP 005 123

AUTHOR Strowbridge, E. D.
TITLE Cooperative Program in Teacher Education: Model for an Educational Complex.
INSTITUTION Corvallis School District 509J, Oreg.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Clinical Professors, *College School Cooperation, *Elementary Schools, *Field Experience Programs, Individualized Instruction, Inservice Teacher Education, Master Teachers, *Preservice Education, Student Teaching, Supervisory Training, *Teacher Education, Teacher Supervision, Team Teaching, Ungraded Elementary Programs

ABSTRACT

This cooperative program between three elementary schools and the Oregon State University Division of Elementary Education provides a complete program of teacher education from college sophomore level to inservice for supervising teachers. It is committed to the development of new approaches such as multi-graded classrooms, individualized instruction, and team teaching. The preservice teachers participate in classroom activities for 4 half-days each week at the sophomore and junior levels, with the remainder of the day devoted to seminars taught primarily by college staff. Student teachers work full-time in the classroom for one semester. The resident teacher experience is for students who have completed student teaching, but desire additional experience in the classroom; it is similar to internship. A two-course inservice sequence in instruction and supervision is available for cooperating teachers. An important factor in the success of the program is considered to be the two joint university-school appointments, one a classroom teacher, and one a school of education staff member. Data is presently being collected for evaluation of the program. (RT)

ED053082

Superintendent's Office
#106
November 17, 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM IN TEACHER EDUCATION

MODEL FOR AN EDUCATIONAL COMPLEX

Developed and submitted by:
Dr. Ed Strowbridge

Board of Education
Corvallis School District No. 509J
1555 S. W. 35th Street
Corvallis, Oregon
Clarence D. Kron, Superintendent

SP003 123

CORVALLIS SCHOOL DISTRICT 509J
Corvallis, Oregon

INTRODUCTION

Efforts to expand and extend the learning opportunities of children are increasing rapidly. Innovative means of approaching learning and instruction are emerging from practical applications of theory and research, are being broadly implemented, and in turn are producing significant changes in staffing, classroom organization, and curriculum.

The processes of learning have been the subject of considerable re-examination and restatement, especially in context of the classroom and children. Jerome Bruner, Piaget and J. P. Guilford are among those who have provided significant interpretation and guidelines.

Instruction, itself, has been further implemented in terms of learning processes.

Taba, Gallagher, Karplus, Beberman, are representative of those who have translated the theory and research into teaching-learning procedures and programs.

Certainly larger groups such as those who have worked out basic programs as SMSG, SCIS, the Minnesota, and Man: A Course of Study, and the Nebraska materials have further implemented this translation.

Major changes in classroom organization have been designed and put into practice in order to accommodate the theoretical and curricular innovations. Individualized instruction, multigraded classrooms, open rooms, team teaching, differentiated staffing, multimedia approaches, and use of paraprofessionals are all in operation. We know that they are existent in many stages of development, in many different forms and in many different combinations.

Simultaneously, teacher education at the undergraduate and graduate levels is experiencing considerable re-orientation. Field experience over an extended period of time in a number of different circumstances -- the teaching ladder -- is a principle example. More concrete means of identifying and assessing teacher behavior is a second example. Flanders, Cogan, Gallagher, and Allan and Bush certainly are to be considered representative contributors to this phase.

Evaluation of curriculum and instruction in terms of demonstrated pupil outcomes or behaviors is becoming increasingly important. Several levels and types of cognitive, affective, and motor learning behaviors have been identified, described and used. The extent to which behaviors are actually being realized, the degree to which behaviors of the individual student are <u>really</u> changing, is a major concern.

The continuous identification and description of new concepts and skills in the three broad areas of behavior is also a principle concern. Performance objectives have thus become an integral part of teaching.

This paper describes the efforts of one school district and a school of education to cooperatively combine these concerns into an educational complex.

Clarence D. Kron

Ed Strowbridge

ES:fb
11-16-70

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The Purpose

The cooperative planning, organization, and implementation of an undergraduate elementary teacher education complex within several neighborhood elementary schools was the original objective for this project. The total complex was conceived of as an equal partnership endeavor in teacher education between Corvallis School District No. 509J and the Division of Elementary Education, Oregon State University. The teacher education program itself, was designed to include a beginning sophomore level, the intermediate level at the junior year, and student teacher and resident teacher levels at the senior year. Each of these levels of teacher education students is intended to operate in the schools in conjunction with, and in support of, innovative developmental instructional programs and classroom-staffing organizations being planned, or under way in the schools. As the program evolved, a total professional education program has emerged. Classroom teachers have joined directly in educating new teachers, and are actively participating with university staff in two teaching teams. A sequential teacher inservice program in instruction, supervision, and classroom organization for teachers and graduate students who are working with OSU students, completes this total program idea.

The program, at its present stage of development, is directly involved in the following aspects of instruction and curriculum:

1. The teaching hospital concept and the teaching ladder for teacher education.
2. Non-graded or multi-graded classroom organization in three elementary schools.
3. Individualized and personalized instruction.
4. Differentiated staffing and team teaching in several elementary schools and within the Division of Elementary Education.
5. An articulated program in instruction from college sophomore to inservice for supervising teachers.
6. Development of a personalized reading program by the staff of an elementary school.
7. Individualized instruction in mathematics in the form of I. P. I.

Rationale

Continuity. One major basis for the program is the concept that students can best learn the techniques and theory of teaching and learning by being directly involved in teaching children. Involvement here, moreover, must be continuous, it must be undertaken over an extended period of time at several different levels of competency, and it must occur with children in a regular elementary school classroom.

Involvement. Continuous involvement in terms of this program then means that the pre-teacher is expected to be in an assigned classroom for four full mornings or afternoons each week for the sophomore and junior levels; it is exclusive of the full time student teaching. The post-student teaching level, Resident Teacher, both follow the half-day pattern. The fifth morning or afternoon of each level is reserved for seminars. Seminars are designed to integrate classroom teaching experiences with foundation and methods courses in education.

Continuous involvement provides adequate time for students to become genuine, dependable assistants to the classroom teacher, rather than an added concern for the teacher to plan around as has been too often the case previously. The student now has time and opportunity to assist in diagnosis, planning, and evaluation as well as in instruction. Continuity of learning in programs such as reading and methematics has become both a concern and a reality in terms of awareness of the college student. Articulation of the many aspects of the total program also has assumed a real significance to them. Opportunities to observe, to learn, and to teach children in many different situations has resulted in much greater readiness for the professional-theoretical aspects of teaching.

The Classroom Teacher and Teaching Methods. The classroom teacher consistently provides the student a model for instruction and a source for feedback and reinforcement in respect to the student's classroom activities.

The premise that carefully selected classroom teachers have demonstrated the competencies necessary for high level instruction in teaching techniques and skills is a second major basis for this program. This means that the teacher shares responsibility for the education of future teachers with university staff members. It further implies that university staff members must evidence the competencies required for high level instruction of children in the classroom.

Oregon State University Staff. Staff members of the university participate as contributors by devoting a minimum of one morning per week in the school. Assisting the teacher and aides in instruction, in preparation of materials and releasing the teacher for work on curriculum development groups are examples of possible contributions. These activities are in addition to participation in the weekly seminars.

The ultimate outcome of this arrangement is that each individual in the program makes definite and specific contributions to the total classroom program. Students contribute services which allow the teacher to reach more children more frequently. Teachers, in addition to providing a positive model, contribute advice, assistance and evaluation to the university student. Mutual assistance is therefore the first key factor for success.

Classroom Organization as a Factor. A third major premise--or perhaps an observation--is that individualization or personalization of instruction and non-graded classroom organizations demand additional human resources if they are to reach their potential. These resources should generally include several different levels of ability and competence. Further, the most effective and most logical source of these resources is a teacher education program.

A year's experience in an operational program indicates that differentiated staffing becomes almost automatic and the classroom teacher begins to assume the role of instructional strategist or specialist.

The Setting

Hoover School. Participation in the Hoover Project of Corvallis School District 509J provided the opportunity impetus for development of the teacher education program. Hoover School was designed and built to provide flexibility of instruction and curriculum. Mid-way in the construction process one group of three classrooms was further modified into one large open area. Other classrooms open into each other in three sets of three classrooms. Bi-fold doors connect the three classrooms in each set.

Individualization of instruction and non-grading were the foci for both the construction and the staffing and equiping of the building. The concept of a pilot school was firmly established by staff selection as well as by the building itself. Outstanding classroom teachers were invited to apply and volunteer applications were accepted with the understanding that pilot programs and innovative curriculum development would be a permanent commitment by each staff member. I. P. I. mathematics was adopted as part of the curriculum, and individualization explorations of the reading and language arts programs was begun during the first year. Non-grading was initiated at the second and third grade levels.

It was at this point that O. S. U.'s Division of Elementary Education was invited to join the project. Teaching Research also formally entered the project at this time. These resources joined together during the spring of 1969 to examine individualized and personalized instruction and to develop the two curriculum areas along these lines. O. S. U.'s contribution was in the form of two staff members each devoting 1/3 time to the project, organization of a seminar inservice, and twelve post-student teaching seniors or resident teachers.

During the summer of 1969, these three agencies entered into a year-long program which called for completion of the individualized reading program. The idea for a multi-level, competency based, teaching hospital approach to teacher education was developed and outlined as a portion of this proposal. Implementation on a pilot basis came about when school opened that fall.

Jefferson School. Jefferson Elementary School was built to accommodate the self-contained classroom concept. It is a relatively new one-story building with two wings of seven rooms each. Among instructional programs under way when the aide program was initiated include "Man: A Course of Study", and team teaching-inter grading pilot, which was initiated by three classroom teachers in the building.

Both student teachers and resident teachers were a part of the school last year. No aides were assigned here. During the summer of 1970, a school district teacher inservice was combined with a summer school program as a part of the Corvallis School Improvement Program. The SCIS science, Minnesota Social Studies, and the Nebraska Language Arts curricula and materials provided for the organization. Six classrooms, three for science and three for the humanities, were established under teams of master teachers. Teams of teachers who would be using the materials in elementary classrooms during the school year were assigned to these centers. Building principals were directly responsible for coordination and articulation. Each room was organized as an ungraded or multi-level K-6 room.

Five regular O.S.U. staff members were directly involved. One individual represented anthropology, another represented science education, two represented elementary education, and one represented educational foundations. Graduate level courses and seminars were offered in each of these levels for the school district personnel and O.S.U. summer school students. Advanced science methods, seminar in science curriculum, reading and conference in anthropology, advanced methods in Language Arts and Social Studies, Kindergarten Education, Diagnostic and Corrective Techniques in Basic Skills, Elementary School Administration and Supervision, and Elementary School Curriculum were offered. Individual study based on individual need was encouraged.

One of the many outcomes of this summer program was the planning, organization, and implementation of a K-6 multi-grade open room at Jefferson. Four teachers were responsible for this development and have formed a team to bring it about. Team teaching with differentiated staffing based on teaching expertise was the result. Both multi-grading and individualized instruction form the basis for organization. O.S.U. student teachers, teacher aides and tutors--eleven in all--are a part of this program, as is a staff representative.

In addition to the multi-graded team, other O.S.U. students at Jefferson are part of teaching teams which use other forms of individualized instruction and flexible grouping.

Harding School. Harding School is one of the older buildings in the district. However, many of the teachers, like those at Hoover and Jefferson, took an active part in the cooperating teacher program and in the district summer school project. Self contained classrooms still predominate in this building, but non-grading and individualized instruction pilot programs are in several stages of development.

Self contained classrooms continue to play an important role at Jefferson and Harding. As a result, O.S.U. students are presented opportunities for observation and participation in this type of classroom organization. The classroom teachers in these situations provide excellent instructional models for O.S.U. students. Where it is possible, all students in the building are given opportunities to work in each type of situation.

Student Participants

Four levels of preparation and competency are now in operation within the program. The levels include the sophomore tutor level, the aide at the junior year, student teacher, and resident teacher at the post-student teaching level. Students may enter at any of the four stages. As the program develops, it is expected that a large majority of students will enter as sophomores and complete all four levels generally over a three year period. This schedule enables the students to return to campus for the other two terms of each year in order to complete institutional requirements and the School of Education requirements. However, opportunity to participate in any level will remain open on the basis of individual capabilities.

Tutors. Fourteen sophomores are now participating at the tutor level. They have been assigned to three schools: Harding, Hoover, and Jefferson. All fourteen work in the afternoons from 12:00 noon until 3:30-4:00 p.m. The group is a pilot group and is designed to complement and extend the morning programs.

Aides. Sixteen teacher aides initiated the aide program in the Fall of 1969. The entire group were seniors, and all were assigned to Hoover. Fifteen of the sixteen continued at Hoover the next term as student teachers; fourteen of the group completed the program as resident teachers during spring term. One dropped at the end of fall term because of pregnancy, the other decided, during student teaching, not to continue in education.

Thirty-two juniors began the aide program this fall. They were assigned as follows: twelve at Harding, twelve at Hoover (including kindergarten), and eight at Jefferson. All teacher aides have morning assignments, although some have also volunteered for additional afternoon times. Selection procedures for the group included survey of the "Admittance to Teacher Education" form, recommendation by at least one staff member, personal record files, and interview. A waiting list of approximately twenty-five applicants for winter term will be screened in the near future. As soon as formal announcement of the program has been made, this list gives some indication of the interest in the program.

Student Teachers. Student teacher assignments last year at Hoover included four at Hoover. Two were assigned the "open room" and were consequently part of the team of three teachers and three aides. Eight adults were available to approximately ninety children. Five student teachers were assigned to Jefferson, five to Harding, and five each to Mountain View and Roosevelt Schools. Each of the schools is participating in the cooperating teacher inservice program.

Eighteen of the fall term cooperating teachers agreed to work with a second student teacher and to participate in the second inservice for winter term. In addition, a new group of twelve student teachers and cooperating teachers was added. A teachers' inservice class was established for this group.

Spring term student teaching program also enrolled thirty student teachers. A new group of eighteen cooperating teachers replaced those of fall and winter terms. The twelve cooperating teachers of winter term continued on with a second student teacher.

Residents. Resident teachers were first used at Hoover during the Spring of 1969. Many students have expressed regret over the ending of their student teaching experience and have expressed a strong desire to remain, at least part time, in a classroom. The intent was to provide a select group of O. S. U. student teachers with this additional experience they had requested. The intent was also to provide the staff at Hoover assistants with levels of experience and capabilities necessary for support of instruction and development of the individualized reading program. One of these resident teachers subsequently joined the staff at Hoover as a regular teacher.

No residents were identified for fall term 1969. Carry-over students with necessary qualifications are difficult to locate. Seven residents were identified and admitted for winter term. Each was required to submit a written proposal which specified what they intended to do, how they would carry out these plans, and how their work would be evaluated. Assignments were highly individualized and differed from student teaching as follows:

1. Kindergarten at Hoover from first grade at Hoover
2. Reliable resource for teachers in the primary group, aide and individualized reading task force groups, aide to resource teacher, I. P. I. assistance from intermediate grades.

3&4. Special reading project for first and second graders with slow progress but good apparent ability at Jefferson. This spilled over into mathematics and language arts, as well. Program involved diagnosis, planning, teaching, and evaluation almost independent of cooperating teacher supervision. Student teaching had been completed at first and third grade levels.

5. Administrative assistant to the principal at Harding from sixth grade at Harding.
6. Special work with remedial reading teacher two half days, with the speech therapist two half days, and with the school librarian one half day from fourth grade. Students were assigned to her for supervised work in each area.
7. Mathematics and science resource for primary grades at Harding from fifth grade.

University courses included Diagnostic and Remedial Techniques in Basic Skills as a common base. Others included Child Psychology, Kindergarten Education, Elementary School Curriculum, Elementary School Administration and Supervision, and a seminar. Supporting courses on campus included Remedial Reading, Guidance and Counseling, and Audio Visual Aides.

Thirty-four resident teachers were identified and assigned for Spring term, 1970. Five elementary schools were involved. Students were assigned from requests by the schools only. The university did not ask to assign any individual. Again, assignments were according to needs of the individual student and of the school. Course work centered around a seminar in Diagnostic and Corrective Techniques in the Basic Skills. Most students also enrolled in campus-based courses identical to those of winter term. Nine hours seminar was used to cover the half day work in the schools.

Staff

One of the strongest features of the total project is the fact that staffing was established and continues as a cooperative, shared effort, involving teachers, building principals, special education teachers, teachers from the Division of Elementary Education, and staff from the central office of Corvallis School District 509J.

Classroom Teachers. A majority of the classroom teachers began their participation during the 1969-70 school year. Twenty-six of the group have completed the two-course inservice sequence in instruction and supervision offered as part of last year's student teacher-cooperating teacher program. Tutors and aides are assigned only after a request has been made by the school. The role of these classroom teachers is to act as instructional models for the O.S.U. students, to provide immediate feedback and reinforcement for them in terms of their classroom activities, to help set the direction of methods seminars through comment and suggestion, and to assist in the teaching of the seminars.

Administrators. Building principals have several key roles. Orientation to the building, school organization, curriculum, district policies, and general procedures. Informal instruction and formal instruction as part of the seminars is also an important function. Perhaps the most important is that of communicator between elementary school staff and university staff. The principals' access ability and openness in relaying concerns, comments, questions and suggestions to all concerned cannot be minimized as a key factor in the success of the program so far. They too, have participated in the teacher inservice classes and have invited the university staff to actively participate in school routine. Classroom teaching, attendance at faculty meetings, open visitation policies, and inclusion in professional meetings and activities are examples of how school of education staff have been included.

A district-wide meeting of elementary school principals, elementary education coordinator, assistant superintendent and concerned members of the staff of the Division of Elementary Education was held in March, 1970. The total program was outlined and explained at this time. Opportunity for questions and discussion was made and taken advantage of. In retrospect this was also a key factor in moving the program ahead. The meeting was particularly valuable in terms of communication between the district and O.S.U., developing the idea of a partnership in education and developing an attitude of mutual concern and responsibility. These meetings will be continued and hopefully will be incorporated into the planning and evaluation phases of any future developments.

Oregon State University Staff. University staff has been deeply involved in many ways. Two staff members taught the methods seminars on a team basis during the 1969-70 school year. This year six regular staff members have teamed to teach methods in language arts, science, social studies, mathematics and child growth and development. The team meets once each week in a planning session and all actively participate in the weekly Thursday morning methods seminar. Each member has been assigned a particular school as a means to increase the cooperative effort through active participation in instruction and maintenance of communication. Usually one full morning or afternoon each week is set aside for this purpose. Each staff member is also free to visit any of the other schools at any time. In fact, they are encouraged to do this.

One staff member this year, also holds the Friday afternoon seminars for the sophomore tutors. This seminar blocks Contemporary Education, School in American Life and Teacher Aide Seminar. Ideally, this would become the actual F. T. E. assignment of one or possibly a team of instructors. The team would include staff from elementary education, the foundations division and classroom teachers.

Coordination of the program within the university is the shared responsibility of two staff members. Duties include assignment of student teachers, scheduling of tutors, aides, and residents, scheduling and organizing classes with the school district, and maintaining liaison with all participants.

Joint Appointments. Two joint appointments have also been an important factor in the successful operation of the program. One classroom teacher holds a .33 univeristy-.67 joint appointment. Responsibilities of this teacher are specifically the supervision of student teachers and participation on the team for student teaching seminars. This person has also made a tremendous contribution to the total program in terms of communication between all individuals at all levels. This is identified as another of those keys for success.

The second joint appointment is that of a School of Education staff member. This is a .50-.50 appointment. Responsibilities have been specified in such a manner as to be mutually compatable with the total program. A concomitant responsibility from the district side is to assist in the development of similar programs at the junior high school and high school levels. The junior high school effort is now active in the pilot stage.

Other staff participate, generally, as resource people. They enter and exit seminars, communication, planning organization and evaluation as their expertise is needed. This includes four doctoral candidates who are taking work in instruction and supervision.

Emphasis throughout this entire area is on teaming for instruction across all levels with expertise in specific areas as a major criterion.

The Curriculum

Formal Courses. Course work for O.S.U. students at each of the four levels is organized into units of twelve credit hours each. A common theme is used to tie the courses in each unit together. At this stage of development specific numbers and titles have been retained in order to meet university and basic certification requirements. A minimum of twelve credit hours in each unit is necessary to ensure that students can devote four hours every day to classroom responsibilities and still meet credit hour requirements for graduation.

Reorganization of scope and sequence of these units is currently under way. Activities performed and responsibilities assumed by students at each level are being identified, observed, described and classified. Students, classroom teachers, administrators and university staff all contribute to this process. As major endeavors evolve, performance objectives will be stated and then used to further develop appropriate curriculum.

Tutors. The tutor level, unit one, now includes Contemporary Education, School in American Life, Educational Psychology and Seminar: Student Tutor. Emphasis in on children in the classroom environment. Educational Foundations is intended as the basic theme for this unit.

Aides. The teacher aide unit includes methods of language arts, social science, science and mathematics, child psychology and seminar: Student Aides. Students enroll in any combination of four courses. This unit is presently taught as a seminar by a four member team which is developing instruction as a basic theme with special topics in each area. The impact of tutors advancing to this level is constantly bringing about revision in this phase. A very brief outline of the present aide program has been included as a means of describing typical activities. A tentative program for evaluation of both tutor and aide levels follows this descriptive outline.

Experience with teacher aides who have participated in joint 509J - OSU programs reveals that a number of contributions are to be expected through this type of classroom organization. The results of these activities are mutually shared by the students, the classroom teacher and the teacher aide.

The students benefit through increased attention by there teacher in terms of direct instruction. Increased opportunity for individualized learning is particularly obvious.

The teacher benefits through increased time available for planning and organizing the instructional program. Time for attention to individual students and to small groups for additional instruction becomes possible. Enrichment as a part of the program becomes much more feasible.

The teacher aide benefits through assuming direct responsibility for specified aspects of the learning process. Many of these responsibilities seem, at times, to be quite routine, yet they form the basis for intelligent decision making in subsequent instruction.

The outline which follows is intended to identify some of the contributions made by the teacher aides:

A. Diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses of both individuals and groups.

1. Daily work
   Correction, subsequent conferencing, recording progress, maintaining continuous progress profiles, and identification of specific levels of knowledge and concept development.

2. Tests
   Information identical to thatobtained from daily work.
   Comparison/contrast between the two.

3. Observation
   Active observation while students are involved in seat work, discussion or other activities. Rate of learning and work, amount of knowledge and understanding and motivation are points of particular concern. Questions or comments to individuals for further information are appropriate.

4. Activity Sessions
   Informal contact. Assist both individuals and groups with assignments. Opportunity to assess learning skills, difficulties, areas of interest and attitudes.

B. Planning instructional programs for individuals and groups. Diagnosis must provide the basis for this set of activities.

1. Skills, information and concepts
   Appropriate timing for introduction based on need for them in terms of learning speed or rate of introduction. Selection of appropriate specific skills and concepts.

B. (Continued)

2. Methods
Appropriate approaches of instruction based on student needs -- introduction. Selection of possible learning activities with adequate alternatives. Provision for review and reinforcement, use and evaluation. Introduction, trial and evaluation of new methods/innovations which would include individualization of instruction, team teaching, instructional strategist role and non-grading.

3. Materials
Selection and production based on skills and concepts to be taught, methods to be used and individuals (groups) involved. Teacher aides can and should assume a major responsibility, thus freeing the teacher for additional instruction or planning time.

Development of supplementary materials, materials preparation for individuals and individualized instruction.

C. Instruction

1. Individual and group instruction in basic skill and knowledge areas.

a. Building, maintaining and refining fundamental learning skills. This includes reading: word identification, comprehension, recreational, research, communication: writing, speaking, listening; number operations; science and social sciences.

b. Building, maintaining, and refining fundamental knowledge and information. All areas of the curriculum should be included.

c. Building, maintaining and refining skills in recognizing appropriate information. Locating, using and remembering (recall or memory) pertinent information. (cognition and memory)

d. Stating objectives for learning in terms of measurable behaviors.

2. Individual and group instruction in specific teaching-learning skills. This would include:

a. Introduction to lessons (set)
b. Establishing appropriate frames of reference
c. Ending a lesson (closure)
d. Recognizing and attending behavior
e. Providing feedback
f. Employing rewards and punishments (reinforcement)
g. Control of participation

C. Instruction (Continued)

2. (continued)

h. Redundancy and repetition
i. Illustrating and use of examples (models)
j. Asking questions
k. Use of higher order questions
l. Use of probing questions
(a) asking for more information/meaning
(b) justify response
(c) refocus attention on a related issue
(d) prompting (hints)
(e) bringing other students in
m. Teacher silence and non-verbal cues
n. Student-initiated questions
o. Varying the stimulus situation
p. Lecturing
q. Pre-cueing

3. Individual and group instruction in intellectual skills and abilities.

a. Introduction, development, application and refinement of higher level thinking strategies. These would include problem solving; inquiry; memory; inductive, deductive and evaluative thinking at several different levels of competency, cognitive levels dealing with facts and information, concept development and generalizations; pattern identification; and the creative processes. (Don't forget analysis, synthesis.)

b. Use of appropriate activities and instructional materials for proper development of these skills. This would include problem development, discussion, lecture, model construction, review and independent study.

c. Application of teaching-learning skills in C-2.

D. Evaluation

1. Students and the learning process.

a. Individual and group progress in terms of needs and abilities as identified through diagnosis. This would involve not only intellectual, but also social and emotional areas.

b. Development and use of self-evaluation by the individual student and group.

D. Evaluation (Continued)

1. (continued)

c. Reporting progress through pupil-teacher conference on a regular basis.

d. Appraising pupil progress for teacher-teacher aide planning and for pupil-teacher - teacher aide planning.

e. Reporting progress to parents through conferencing. Maintaining and use of recording for reporting.

2. Planning and instruction

a. Consistency of student learning (outcome) in terms of stated objectives.
   1. what has been learned
   2. how much has been learned
   3. what length of time was needed
   4. how accurate was the learning

b. Consistency of content, skills, activities, materials and evaluations with objectives.

c. Consistency of instructional approaches in terms of stated objectives.
   1. comparison and consistency with teaching skills
   2. consistency in terms of content and/or intellectual skills stated in objectives.
   3. development of means to gather concrete data
      (a) Teaching-learning patterns through pupil-teacher interaction
      (b) teaching-learning patterns through verbation data
      (c) Origination of new or variations of teaching-learning patterns, particularly with higher level strategies.

d. Consistency of classroom organization patterns in terms of stated objectives.
   1. Self-contained, team teaching, individualized, non-graded
   2. Teacher-centered, child-centered, activity-centered

e. Consistency of curriculum in terms of stated objectives.
   1. Regular or customary curriculum
   2. Special programs: SCIS, Minnesota Social Studies; Nebraska language arts

EVALUATION

I. The proposed program
Items identified here are those stated in the proposal.

A. Program evaluation
1. Program objectives
a. definition of skills and competencies in behavioral terms
b. individualization and personalization teaching skills and competencies
c. provide a laboratory setting
d. develop ways and experiences to accomplish specified outcomes
e. improve quality of instruction
f. establish cooperative effort and joint responsibility between O.S.U. and Corvallis District 509J

2. Individual objectives
a. ability to perform or demonstrate skills and competencies (teacher, teacher-aide)
b. identify conditions and content (setting) for demonstrations
c. indicate acceptable levels of performance

B. General Objectives
1. Educational change - create
a. climate for change
b. realistic setting for change
c. setting for teacher inservice
d. attitudes and capabilities for planning and implementing
e. experiences for parents

2. O.S.U. Trainees
a. realistic educational setting
b. integrate theoretical and practical
c. introduce teaching tasks and give experience
d. earlier continual acceptance of responsibility
e. close supervision by peers and staff
f. develop a career ladder

3. Curriculum
a. involve teachers in curriculum development
b. instructional objectives across disciplinary lines
c. develop a problem centered approach
d. personalization and individualization of integrated units
e. develop a curriculum relevant to junior high students
f. tracking systems academic-vocational
g. develop a wider range of courses

EVALUATION (Continued)

I. (continued)

B. General Objectives (contiued)

4. Students
   a. develop relevant programs
   b. develop staff better able to individualize and personalize instruction
   c. involve students in program planning
   d. wider range of courses and experiences
   e. increased participation for time use
   f. involve a wider range of adults

5. Teachers
   a. develop new staffing patterns and new inputs into learning process
   b. develop climate for systematic study of educational processes
   c. opportunity for planning, analysis and evaluation of teaching
   d. develop differentiated staffing pattern
   e. formulate philosophy and curriculum for school and teacher trainees
   f. work into cooperative teaching and new staffing patterns

6. Community
   a. develop working relationship with parents and community
   b. develop structure for intergroup planning for instruction and curriculum
   c. develop experiences for parents for change
   d. increase student involvement in community life

II. The Instructional Program
Evaluation in this section will be concerned with the items identified as possible benefits.

A. Diagnosis
B. Planning
C. Instruction
D. Evaluation

III. Possible Evaluation Program

A. Scope of Evaluation

1. Involve pertinent items in I and II
2. Evolve set of behavior-performance objectives in each area as a basis for evaluation.

EVALUATION (Continued)

III. (continued)

A. Scope of Evaluation (continued)

2. (continued)
   a. involve teacher aide, teaching staff, student
   b. use taxonomy of behavioral objectives
      (1) Cognitive
      (2) Affective

3. Introduction and use of means of monitoring individualization and personalization of instructional patterns

4. Introduction and use of means of monitoring instruction and instructional patterns
   a. clinical supervision - supervision cycle
   b. interaction analysis
   c. teaching styles - classroom Interaction Analysis

B. Means of Data Collection

1. Written observations
   a. logs pinpointing events, attitudes (continuous)
   b. descriptions
      (1) the classroom
      (2) a (the) students (characteristics)
      (3) teaching, the instructional process
      (4) verbatim typescripts
   c. examinations
   d. checklists or ratings

2. Video taping
   a. micro teaching (lessons)
   b. mini lessons
   c. simulation tapes
   d. teaching demonstrations from technical skills, interaction analysis, teaching styles (Gallagher)
   e. instructional strategies - Taba, Inquiry, Discovery

3. Conferencing

4. Interview

C. Evaluation Schedule

1. Evaluation in terms of written data is both continous (log) and periodic. Descriptions, ratings, etc., should be on a pretest, post-test basis. Additional items may be done as needed during the term.

EVALUATION (Continued)

III. (continued)

C. Evaluation Schedule (continued)

2. Collection of concrete data, video taping; recording of lessons, should be done on a regularly scheduled basis throughout the term.

3. Conferencing should be done and notes kept:
   (a) immediately after each rating
   (b) immediately after each recording session
   (c) following regular instruction

D. Areas of Special Concern

1. Identification and analysis of change in instructional activities
   (a) time allotments
   (b) planning
   (c) demands on teacher
   (d) number of children met

2. Identification and analysis of instruction
   (a) classroom organization:
   team teaching, individualization, non-grading, interdisciplinary, etc.
   (b) teaching styles, teaching patterns
   (c) learning-learning theory (Bruner, Piaget)

3. Identification and analysis teachers role
   (a) as a supervisory
   (b) as a curriculum developer
   (c) as an instructional strategist
   (d) as a deligator of authority and director of human resources.

Student Teachers. Student teaching is the third unit and is now offered in the senior year. Full days, five days per week are required in this program. Seminars are held every other week. Curriculum development will be dependent upon that at the tutor and aide levels.

Residents. Resident teaching uses Seminar: Resident Teaching and Practicum for nine credit hours. The other course, Diagnostic and Corrective Techniques in Basic Skills, is used as the central theme for the unit. The intent is to capitalize on previous experience and to further refine instructional abilities and techniques.

Teacher Inservice. A fifth unit, cooperating teacher inservice, has been developed around a three course sequence. Instructional Strategies is the central theme. Topics include interaction analysis, technical skills of teaching and micro-teaching, behavioral objectives in terms of the cognitive domain, and teaching styles as presented by the Aschner-Gallagher system.

Development of performance criteria and individualization of the student's program in teacher education are major goals.

Evaluation

Much of the evaluation program also forms the basis for the ongoing curriculum development program.

Participants at each level are required to keep a daily log of activities, duties, observations and comments. Each aide and tutor is assigned the task of writing pre and post descriptions of a typical classroom, and a typical student. Teachers use observation interaction analysis and other supervisory devices to gather data on specific teaching techniques and instructional activities of the student. As time and physical resources permit, video taping will increasingly become an integral part of this process.

The 1969-70 program has been systematically and cooperatively evaluated as a part of the Hoover Project. An evaluation schedule and the various means of evaluation cited above were developed jointly by O.S.U. staff, Hoover staff, and Teaching Research specialists. A similar program is planned for this year.

EDS:ba
10-26-70